

FutureGen Questions on SOW

Questions/Assumptions

(1) The SOW states “cost estimates should be based on the assumption that the EIS would cover three site alternatives and one base-case technology for each phase.”

- Is any costing information beyond three sites to be included in the proposal? **Yes, the requirements will be provided along with the Request for Task Proposals. See “Instructions to Offerors”.**

(2) Page 21 states “The Draft EIS will analyze impacts of the proposed FutureGen Project for one or more alternative sites and one or more power plant configurations (alternative technologies), and no-action alternative.”

- How many alternative configurations should be assumed for each site when preparing cost estimates? **Assume one base-case technology alternative, which is a power plant configuration. See “Instruction to Offerors”.**
- Should it be assumed that each configuration will be carried forwards for full analysis? **Yes, each power plant configuration would be carried through full analyses and discussed in comparative form.**

(3) Some aspects of the project, like transmission corridors and fuel shipment routes may not be identified with the proposed sites.

- Does DOE anticipate updates to the EIV as these features are identified while the EIS is being prepared? **The Alliance has committed to provide a partial draft EIV on or about September 22, 2006 and a final EIV on or about December 1, 2006. All site characterization information to be included in the EIS must be in the final EIV, except for information that the Contractor must collect to complete its analyses. If the Alliance is late in providing EIVs or information on things like transmission corridors and fuel shipment routes, then the EIS may be delayed. The site RFP issued by the Alliance does request information on transmission corridors and fuel shipment options.**
- Will a deadline be provided, after which point new EIV data and project data will no longer be considered for inclusion in the EIS? **The deadline is December 1, 2006, except that DOE and the Alliance may agree to a schedule slippage. Any such agreed-upon schedule slippage would not affect the Contractor’s incentive fee.**

(4) Page 28 – “...the Contractor could be required to make reasonable assumptions about the likely size and layout of facilities plus inputs and outputs when assessing the potential for impacts and risks.”

- Since specific information is not available about the sites and project (i.e.; layout, size, etc.) is it correct to assume that DOE is expecting contractors to use their judgment when developing cost estimate assumptions? **Prospective contractors should rely on their experience in developing cost estimates. For cost estimating, the costs would be averaged over three sites in the base case. Each additional site**

improves the averaging and reduces the risks associated with atypical sites. While the Alliance should deliver site characterization information and conceptual design information, the Contractor must make reasonable attempts (under the circumstances) to fill information gaps, if any. When developing the cost estimate, the Offeror should use their judgment about how much investigation (including field work) may be required to reach minimal-level EIS coverage for issues when the required minimum level of information has not been provided by the Alliance. The Alliance is supported by Battelle in the development of the EIVs and in the planning and conceptual design process for the project. **The Contractor is not expected to make-up for any lack of project planning and design work.**

(5) Will Draft versions of the EIV as listed in the schedule (9/22) be made available to the contractor for use in planning field studies? Yes. Most, if not all, of the field work should be completed by the Alliance and the site proponents; and much of the field work should be completed and presented in the draft EIVs. The Contractor will help the DOE review the draft EIVs and help recommend additional field work to be undertaken by the Alliance and site proponents. To expedite the development of the EIS and to gain site-specific knowledge, the Contractor may offer to collect specific information.

(6) What, if any, assumptions should be made with respect to state agency involvement and the potential for Joint document production (i.e.; SEPA) for costing purposes. Is it safe to assume that the contractor will not be asked to prepare separate SEPA specific documents for this project if the NEPA document cannot reasonably serve both purposes? We expect that State agencies may request various levels of involvement; and they should be made to feel welcome, although we will not actively seek cooperative agency status for them. SEPA compliance is the responsibility of the Alliance, although the Contractor may facilitate the Alliance's usage of the NEPA documents to fulfill SEPA requirements. The Contractor would not produce new documents or significantly modify NEPA documents to meet SEPA requirements. A paragraph on this issue is included in the SOW under the "Scope of Work" section for each Phase.

(7) Is it correct to assume that DOE is expecting contractors to include costs estimates for potential fieldwork, and if so, to use their judgment when developing cost estimate assumptions related to fieldwork that may be required? Yes. The Alliance is obligated to perform most, if not all, of the field work. Experience suggests that the Contractor will need to perform some field work at each site to fill any gaps that appear during the development of the EIS and when responding to comments. The Contractor must also check the work products submitted by others and must become sufficiently familiar with each site through various site visits. When making a proposal in response to this SOW, the cost estimates should include the assumptions used.

(8) It is correct to assume there will be one scoping meeting per site and one public involvement meeting per site. No. The base case cost estimate covers three sites and four scoping meetings (assuming one site may have two scoping meetings because of the

distance between the proposed power plant site and the proposed sequestration site) plus four public hearings. See “Instructions to Offerors”.

(9) The draft schedule allows only 2 months for the proponent to prepare the EIV. Will the contractor be provided the opportunity to request the level of information to be included in the EIV to ensure consistency between sites? Yes. DOE expects that the Contractor and the Alliance contractor (Battelle) will work closely together to develop the content of the EIVs. In addition, DOE expects to host a kick-off meeting, immediately after the announcement of the candidate sites, to brief the site proponents on the expectations for data coverage and quality.

(10) Are there any identified cooperating agencies at this point? No.

(11) Is DOE expecting cost estimates to be provided for all three phases? Yes. See “Instructions to Offerors”.

(12) Does DOE expect that a GPO printer will be required and if so will the production cost be the responsibility of contractor? We are uncertain at this time whether a GPO printer will be required. The SOW specifies, for cost estimating purposes, that the Contractor would procure printing, presumably with a private-sector printing provider (who may also be a GPO contractor).

(13) When will the site proposals for candidate sites be made available to the contractor? The site proposals will be available for viewing at a location provided by the Alliance at the same time that DOE can view the proposals. Release to the Contractor of copies of the site proposals (at least those on the Candidate Site List) is subject to Alliance and DOE joint approval. Relevant information from the site proposals will be provided in the EIV’s, along with other information.

(14) Will Draft EIV, Final Conceptual Design, and the Preferred Facility Configuration be made available to the contractor at the same time they are submitted to DOE? Yes.

(15) Is DOE expecting the risk evaluation approach to be included in the technical proposal? No.

(16) Project Background and Proposed Action, 5. Proposed project schedule and NEPA schedule:

- What is expected to be included in the letters of commitment for the Key Personnel? The letters are expected to state the level of commitment (such as percentage of work time available) to this Contract for the scheduled NEPA effort for those key personnel who will be engaged throughout the process. For those key personnel who will be engaged only for relatively brief periods of time, the letters should explain the periods when they would be engaged under this

Contract, their roles or functions, and their availability during these periods of engagement. Because of the extremely aggressive schedule, it is required that key personnel be available during the times when their services are required. Therefore the commitment letters should establish a commitment, within reasonable limits, to meet the schedule requirements under this SOW.

(17) Phase II, 1. Objective:

- Will the EIS contractor be allowed to work with DOE on the data requirements set forth in the RFP for the EIVs for each candidate site? The site RFP has already been issued and is currently available for download from the Alliance website (www.futuregenalliance.org). See answer to question 9, above.
- Will the RFP for the EIVs require an equivalent level of detail for each candidate site? Neither the site RFP nor the EIV guidance document requires an equivalent level and quality of information from each site. Hopefully, the guidance document provides some assurance of equivalent breadth of coverage at each site. See answer to question 9, above.
- In the fifth paragraph of this section, it states “The DOE’s guidance for preparing EIVs is cited as a reference.” Where is the guidance cited and is this document releasable to the EIS contractor? The guidance document is cited in the site RFP for sites. There is a web address provided in the site RFP on page 7. See the Alliance’s website (www.futuregenalliance.org) to download a copy of the site RFP.

(18) Phase II, 2. Scope of work:

- Should it be assumed that the scope of the DEIS includes analysis of the environmental impacts of constructing new electric transmission and gas pipeline storage and transmission infrastructure as implied on p. 22? Yes. See responses to question 3, above.

(19) Phase II, 5.j. Distribution letters and Distribution of the Draft EIS:

- This section states that “It is anticipated that the EIS will be large.....” Does DOE have an estimate in terms of number of pages or how large the document is expected to be? No, we do not have an estimate. Power plant Draft EIS documents tend to be large because of the large number of interfaces between the power plant and the environment. For FutureGen, the EIS must address both the proposed power plant and the sequestration effort for each candidate “site”.